

General Topics :: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?

Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him? - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/17 15:41

Who was the man that John Calvin killed for not agreeing with him and why? Thanks for any information or links posted-

Re: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?, on: 2007/12/17 15:58

Michael Servetus is who you're talking about I think.

Here's one discussion on it:

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id18334&forum36) Calvin and Servetus

and

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id18302&forum36) another one

Re: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?, on: 2007/12/17 16:01

This is what I found and had heard previously:

The most lasting controversy of Calvin's life involves his role in the execution of Michael Servetus, the Spanish physician, and theologian.

Servetus first published his views in 1531 to a wide yet unreceptive audience. He denounced the Trinity, one of the cardinal doctrines that Catholics and Protestants agreed upon. Calvin knew of these views in 1534, when he accepted Servetus' invitation to a small gathering in Paris to discuss their differences in person. For unknown reasons Servetus failed to appear.

Around 1546, Servetus initiated a correspondence with Calvin that lasted until 1548, when the exchange grew so rancorous that Calvin ended it. Each man wrote under a pen name and each tried to win the other to his own theology. Servetus even offered to come to Geneva if invited and given a guarantee of safe passage. Calvin declined to offer either. In 1546 Calvin told Farel, "takes it upon him to come hither, if it be agreeable to me. But I am unwilling to pledge my word for his safety, for if he shall come, I shall never permit him to depart alive, provided my authority be of any avail."

Calvin's zeal was very much the rule among civil and church authorities in 16th century Europe, above all toward Servetus' effort to spread what they deemed heresy. As early as 1533 the Spanish Inquisition had sentenced Servetus to death in absentia. Years later, in 1553, he was charged with heresy while living under an assumed name in Vienne, France. After Servetus escaped from the French prison in April 1553, the authorities there convicted and burned him in effigy.

*Servetus came to Geneva in August 1553 and attended a Sunday church service with Calvin in the pulpit. He was recognized and arrested on Calvin's initiative. And, while Calvin also wrote the heresy charges, Geneva's city council did far more to steer Servetus' trial, sentence, and burning at the stake. Calvin asked the council for a more humane execution – beheading instead of the stake – but his appeal was denied. The sentence was carried out on 27 October 1553. Servetus was burned along with every available copy of his final work, *Christianismi Restitutio*, only three known copies of which survived – two in Calvin's own possession.*

Servetus was the only person "put to death for his religious opinions in Geneva during Calvin's lifetime, at a time when executions of this nature were a commonplace elsewhere," but an angry debate over this incident has continued to the present day. History has certainly judged Calvin to be in the wrong on this issue, and modern Calvinists do not defend his actions against Servetus. Although many of Calvin's detractors portray him as a man who craved power, could not abide any dissent, and is unworthy of the respect that is commonly given to him, his admirers see him as a man who sinned and failed to transcend the ethics of his time, but who is still deserving of honor because of his contributions elsewhere.

Personally I'm not a fan of Calvin the man, and consider myself "middle of the road" when it comes to Calvinism. I think, as with anything else, there are extremes on both sides. There have even been Calvinists on this forum who have declar

General Topics :: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?

ed those who disagreed to be not "truly saved". This is a frightening mirror of what Calvin apparently did to Michael Servetus.

Obviously Michael Servetus was a heretic, but if Calvin had him executed for it, I don't believe that was scriptural at all.

Each man wrote under a pen name and each tried to win the other to his own theology.

...hmmm, sound familiar to anyone?

Krispy

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/17 16:48

Krispy-just a curious question:

Why do you suggest that: " ..obviously Servetus was a heretic"-are you saying that because he denounced the trinity, or because you know a little bit more about this man and other of his doctrine?

To one extent, I know Servetus did NOT believe that Jesus was the "Eternal Son of God"-but he rather believed " Jesus was the Son of the Eternal God"-thus, I guess not believing that Jesus himself was Eternal-it would seem he believed in the trinity in which he denounced.

Thanks for your reply though :-)

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 8:38

Quote:

-----Why do you suggest that: " ..obviously Servetus was a heretic"-are you saying that because he denounced the trinity

Denying the trinity = heresy.

Quote:

-----To one extent, I know Servetus did NOT believe that Jesus was the "Eternal Son of God"-but he rather believed " Jesus was the Son of the Eternal God"-thus, I guess not believing that Jesus himself was Eternal-it would seem he believed in the trinity in which he denounced.

However you slice it, he didn't believe that Jesus was God. If he didn't believe the Trinity but did believe in Jesus' deity, then he would be a polytheist, believing in multiple gods. But the Bible is very clear... there is only ONE God. And Jesus was God manifested in the flesh. John 1:1 is probably the second most powerful verse in the Bible, right behind John 3:16.

Aside from all the other looney-toons theology of Mormonism and JW's, the Trinity is the crux of where those two cults get it wrong, and what makes them heretics right out of the gate... and then it goes downhill from there.

Krispy

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 8:50

Quote:

Denying the trinity = heresy.

Krispy

Let me ask this, what if one does not believe in the trinity, but rather the Godhead-does that constitute heresy?

What if one denies the trinity but believes that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God?

I am just asking because I am curious in yours, or anyone else who would like to respond to those questions.

I, myself, believe totally wholeheartedly in the Eternal Godhead, however I do not accept, or believe in what is commonly referred to as the "trinity"

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/12/18 8:53

What should worrie the ones who dont belive Jesus was God in the flesh, is how could anyone else then God himself pay the price for sin?

If Jesus was not God manifested in flesh, we are all in trouble.....

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 9:27

Quote:

-----I, myself, believe totally wholeheartedly in the Eternal Godhead, however I do not accept, or believe in what is commonly referred to as the "trinity"

So then you believe Jesus is a God? In other words there are more than one God?

I am not the best person to explain the Trinity to you. I have a grasp of it all in my own heart and mind, but to put it into words is not my area of expertise. I think others might be better able to explain it.

What about John 1:1? *"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word **was** God."*

Clearly in the 1st chapter of John it goes on in context to show that the "Word" is none other than Jesus Christ. Chapter 1 verse 1 declares clearly that Jesus **was** God. Period.

In Matthew 1:23 it says: *"Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name **Emmanuel**, which being interpreted is, **God with us**."*

And later on Jesus called himself by the name that the Jews understood from the time of Moses to be the name of God..

.

John 8:58 *"Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, **I am**."*

It was enough for them to charge Him with blasphemey... NOT because He claimed to be the Messiah... but because He claimed to **BE GOD**.

The religious rulers understood exactly what He was saying, and thats what riled them up so bad. If they merely underst

ood Him to be claiming to be the Messiah, they would not have had Him killed. They would have dismissed Him as crazy . But while claiming to be the Messiah He claimed clearly to **be God**.

Therefore, we have no other choice but to believe in the Trinity. Just because our feeble minds can not possibly comprehend all that that entails doesnt mean it isnt true. There are some things we wont ever be able to understand.

And yes, I do believe that you may be in dangerous territory. I dont say that in a judgemental way at all... I say that out of concern. In order to be truly saved it is important that we have a clear understanding of who Christ is. We must put our faith in the Christ of the Bible, and no other Christ.

Krispy

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 10:09

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Quote:
-----I, myself, believe totally wholeheartedly in the Eternal Godhead, however I do not accept, or believe in what is commonly referred to as the "trinity"

So then you believe Jesus is a God? In other words there are more than one God?

I am not the best person to explain the Trinity to you. I have a grasp of it all in my own heart and mind, but to put it into words is not my area of expertise. I think others might be better able to explain it.

What about John 1:1? *"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word **was** God."*

Clearly in the 1st chapter of John it goes on in context to show that the "Word" is none other than Jesus Christ. Chapter 1 verse 1 declares clearly that Jesus **was** God. Period.

In Matthew 1:23 it says: *"Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name **Emmanuel**, which being interpreted is, **God with us**."*

And later on Jesus called himself by the name that the Jews understood from the time of Moses to be the name of God...

John 8:58 *"Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, **I am**."*

It was enough for them to charge Him with blasphemy... NOT because He claimed to be the Messiah... but because He claimed to **BE GOD**.

The religious rulers understood exactly what He was saying, and thats what riled them up so bad. If they merely understood Him to be claiming to be the Messiah, they would not have had Him killed. They would have dismissed Him as crazy. But while claiming to be the Messiah He claimed clearly to **be God**.

Therefore, we have no other choice but to believe in the Trinity. Just because our feeble minds can not possibly comprehend all that that entails doesnt mean it isnt true. There are some things we wont ever be able to understand.

And yes, I do believe that you may be in dangerous territory. I dont say that in a judgemental way at all... I say that out of concern. In order to be truly saved it is important that we have a clear understanding of who Christ is. We must put our faith in the Christ of the Bible, and no other Christ.

Krispy

I do not believe that Jesus Christ is "A" God- I believe Jesus Christ is GOD-even as you quoted, and even as John 1:1 says.

I was never saying I didn't believe Jesus to be God-I was saying the Holy Word of Scripture never refers to the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost as a trinity-but rather the Godhead.

What I would like to say, even in reference to Matt 28:19-if Jesus is God (which he emphatically is), and the Father is God-therefore in Matt 28:19 The "NAME of the Father"-would be JESUS, even as the "NAME of the Son" and the "NAME of the Holy Ghost is JESUS-for there is only ONE GOD.

I meet people who verbally proclaim (and this is not directed to you personally, I am just making a general statement) that they believe Jesus is God, but then when it comes to Matt 28:19 and what is the "NAME of the Father"-they will say every name but Jesus. But if Jesus is the Father, then the Father's name is Jesus-and even these are the words of Christ in his prayer-John 17:6 I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word.

The name that Jesus, our Lord manifested unto them was in fact JESUS

The Holy Word itself defines the Blessed Union as the "Godhead"-not the trinity

Thus, I am simply saying the Eternal Godhead and the trinity are not one and the same teaching. doctrine

As I believe and understand, the term Trinity didn't come along until the time of the Catholic Church-in which to them Jesus was the second in the trinity-and even Mary who was not a part of that trinity held a position higher than Jesus-which is totally unscriptural in any and every degree.

It is Christ in whom we believe, it is Christ's name in whom we must be baptized-both water and Spirit.

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/12/18 11:15

Blazed, we have been through this I don't know how many times...and you are not going to get us to "convert" to your Oneness theology this time either. You are plainly wrong and have been shown verse after verse by many brethren to prove that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are separate, distinct, coexistent, yet one God. They do not morph from one into another depending on how they reveal themselves.

I have never seen anyone interpret Matt. 28:19 the way you do. The Greek construction, which you have right but come up with an absurd interpretation, shows that the three are one. But they are NOT the same. The Father is NEVER referred to as Jesus, and neither is the Holy Ghost. Jesus did not talk to himself in prayer. Jesus did not shout down from heaven at his own baptism while also taking on the form of a dove and descend upon himself. You are turning Jesus into a comic strip superhero with out of body experiences. Your theology denies the incarnation because a man cannot do what you claim Jesus did.

One more thing, how can Jesus be the Father of Himself?

I do not wish to have any more discussion past this, unless you are honestly inquiring.

If I sound harsh, it is because I want you to realize that you are in deep with this theology of yours. You must understand the gravity here.

I love you, brother.

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 11:26

Blazed... I didn't realize that there is a history behind your inquiry of me. As I said previously, I am not the best person when it comes to explaining the Trinity. As stated, I understand what I believe, but just not able to discuss it as eloquently as I would like.

Since there has obviously been discussion about this in the past, and it obviously was with people more capable than I, I agree with BeYeDoers... another discussion of this would not be fruitful. I would recommend you reflect back on the previous discussions you have had.

I am not questioning your motives for bringing it up... just have other things I would rather discuss at this time.

Krispy

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 11:53

Someone please tell me, what is the name of the Father?

Just a simple answer to the direct question will suffice

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 11:57

I AM.

And that ends this discussion.

Krispy

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2007/12/18 12:08

Hi BlazedbyGod...

Quote:

-----Someone please tell me, what is the name of the Father?

Just a simple answer to the direct question will suffice

I'm not sure that a "simple answer" would actually suffice for such a question. Why? Because God has MANY NAMES. We could go from the divine name "YHWH" (and how it morphed with vowels into YeHoWaH --> Jehovah), to descriptive names ("El Shaddai, etc...), and then to the names that are more "titles" (King of Kings, Lord of Lords, Prince of Peace, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, etc...).

The name "Jesus" was simply a name chosen on Earth. By whom? Mary and Joseph. The name "Jesus" (well, actually, "Yeshu" or "Yeshua") was a rather common name at the time. This is somewhat in keeping to the prophecy about the coming of our Lord in Isaiah (...about Him having nothing that would attract us to Him). Jesus was literally the "only begotten son" of the Father. How long was Jesus around and a separate entity from the Father? At least since Creation. Jesus was actively involved in the Creation of this world (John 1:1-5; Colossians 1:16; Genesis 1:26).

So to approach this question in a simple, "matter of fact" manner is somewhat misleading. We know that Jesus is God. But is Jesus the Father? There is a clear distinction the book of John (chapters 15, 16 and 17) that He was not. We also realize this separation in the Old Testament (such as found in Isaiah chapter 6).

:~)

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 12:11

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

I AM.

And that ends this discussion.

Krispy

And is not Jesus Christ this Great "I AM"-yes or No?

General Topics :: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 12:14

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:

Hi BlazedbyGod...

Quote:

-----Someone please tell me, what is the name of the Father?

Just a simple answer to the direct question will suffice

I'm not sure that a "simple answer" would actually suffice for such a question. Why? Because God has MANY NAMES. We could go from the divine name "YHWH" (and how it morphed with vowels into YeHoWaH --> Jehovah), to descriptive names ("El Shaddai, etc...), and then to the names that are more "titles" (King of Kings, Lord of Lords, Prince of Peace, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, etc...).

The name "Jesus" was simply a name chosen on Earth. By whom? Mary and Joseph. The name "Jesus" (well, actually, "Yeshu" or "Yeshua") was a rather common name at the time. This is somewhat in keeping to the prophecy about the coming of our Lord in Isaiah (...about Him having nothing that would attract us to Him). Jesus was literally the "only begotten son" of the Father. How long was Jesus around and a separate entity from the Father? At least since Creation. Jesus was actively involved in the Creation of this world (John 1:1-5; Colossians 1:16; Genesis 1:26).

So to approach this question in a simple, "matter of fact" manner is somewhat misleading. We know that Jesus is God. But is Jesus the Father? There is a clear distinction in the book of John (chapters 15, 16 and 17) that He was not. We also realize this separation in the Old Testament (such as found in Isaiah chapter 6).

:-)

ccchhhrrriiisss, what I meant by simple, was just that I wanted a direct answer-referring to a specific name or lists of names or titles. That is all I meant

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 12:21

No, this is what I refer to as baiting. I won't be baited into this discussion. It's becoming more and more clear that your intention is not to inquire out of honesty, but to get us all involved into a debate about this doctrine because you wish to convince us that you're right.

Personally I respond better to people just declaring their intentions rather than baiting.

Krispy

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 12:26

I asked a simple question, even as I did before:

I asked "is not Jesus Christ this Great "I AM"?"

That is not "baiting"-that is a question-are you the judge of my intent through reading on the internet? You have judged me in saying "that IS MY MOTIVE (intent).

I asked a humble question, and it appears to me, the question I asked doesn't want to be answered because the answer is obvious.

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 12:32

If you weren't baiting and trying to swerve this thread away from the original question then you wouldn't have demanded five times that we answer you.

That's what I am basing my perception of your motives on.

Someone else can pick up the baton if they wish. I have nothing more to offer.

Krispy

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 12:38

Isaiah 9:6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The **everlasting FATHER**, The Prince of Peace.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 12:44

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:
If you werent baiting and trying to swerve this thread away from the original question then you wouldnt have demanded five times that we answer you.

Thats what I am basing my perception of your motives on.

Someone else can pick up the baton if they wish. I have nothing more to offer.

Krispy

No, my original question about Calvin, lead to this-because you said to deny the trinity was heresy-and I responded in short that I do not believe in the trinity but the Godhead as Scripture declares-it is from there that this came to be

But for you to say that this was my plan, or even purposeful intent to SWERVE into this, is a judgement.

I stood up for my beliefs, and I am beat down for it and accused of TRYING TO CONVERT people to MY theology-yet everyone else can state their beliefs defend them and everything is peaches and cream-

Not to mention how many threads start out with a particular question or theme, but eventually go off into two or three other topics-I don't see anything different here.

Re: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him? - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/12/18 12:54

Who is this who says this?

Rev 1:11 Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

we all agree this would be Jesus right?

and who is this?

Isa 44:6 Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.

also this verse

Isa 48:12 Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last.

its good to read all these three chapters in their entirety. But you have to be pretty "unwilling" not to see it.

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 13:28

Quote:
-----I stood up for my beliefs, and I am beat down for it and accused of TRYING TO CONVERT people to MY theology-yet everone else can state their beliefs defend them and everything is peaches and cream-

OK now... if you would calm down for a minute... I stated my main reason for not wanting to discuss this. That being that I do not believe I am the best person to give you the answers you are "looking" for. Said it a couple times, I believe.

You are more than welcome to throw out your points of view on this forum, but when they collide with orthodox teachings that have been held by the Body of Christ since the early church fathers then you should expect some dissention. Ranting, even.

I put my thoughts and beliefs out on this forum all the time, I would hardly say it's always "peaches and cream". Just look at how my views on Bible versions is met.

Quote:
-----Not to mention how many threads start out with a particular question or theme, but eventually go off into two or three other topics-I don't see anything different here.

The difference is I believe (knowing full well that I could be wrong) that you're not asking the questions your asking looking for answers. I think you have an agenda, and your mind is made up, and you already know **your** answers to the questions you're asking.

All I am saying is let's have a little honesty and state what you believe and then ask why people believe what they believe. Why not say "Here is what I believe... and here is why I think you should believe the same way."

That's what I do with the Bible version issue. It's not secret around here where I stand on that issue.

You can ask anyone on this forum who has ever PM'd me with a question... whether it be about theology, or my thoughts on an issue they are dealing with, etc... if you ask me straight about something, honestly seeking my thoughts because you want to learn or understand or discuss it... I will always respond. Always.

But I just sensed that in this case I was deliberately being drawn into an argument backwards, and I don't like it.

Now, if I am wrong, I sincerely apologize for misunderstanding you. I've been wrong before, I'll be wrong again. But that was my *perception*.

I'll discuss anything and everything, and I don't mind being confronted... so long as I know it's coming. I'll jump into the middle of an argument. But if I perceive I am being tricked into an argument, I'll back off. I think that's true for most people.

Krispy

Krispy

Re: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him? - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/18 14:13

Anyone truly interested in this should first read this article

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20001010110156/www.alliancenet.org/pub/mr/mr92/1992.02.MarApr/mr9202.msh.geneva.html>) Was Geneva A Theocracy?

Here is an excerpt-
Was Geneva A Theocracy?
Michael S. Horton

©1992, 1999 Alliance of Confessing Evangelicals

From the first-hand accounts, Oxford's Gillian Lewis notes, "The city of Geneva possessed a significance which was symbolic and mythical. Her friends saw her as the mirror and model of true piety, a haven of refuge, a roosting-place for fledglings, a stronghold to train and dispatch abroad soldiers of the Gospel and ministers of the Word." And yet, there were enemies as well, enemies who saw Geneva as "Satan's sanctuary, a source of heresy, atheism, and libertinage and a centre for the active dissemination of sedition."¹

Just as soon as Geneva embraced the Reformation officially and severed its loyalties to the bishop and Duke of Savoy, the city was flooded with refugees from all over Europe. Overnight Geneva became, after Wittenberg, Zurich, and Strasbourg, a capitol of the Protestant faith. Foreign visitors expressed amazement as they observed both the theological and practical attractions of the city.

Nevertheless, the impressions we received from our high school teachers, more than likely, had little in common with those reported by first-hand witnesses, friend or foe. Images abound of a tyrant in a black academic gown, organizing a sixteenth-century equivalent of the secret police to insure that no one, at any time or any place, was enjoying himself. The amazing thing about this is not the image itself, but the fact that it has survived in the public imagination even though it has been refuted by the consensus of the world's leading Renaissance and Reformation historians for over half a century. The foundation for this public myth is the assertion that Geneva was a theocracy and Calvin was its pope.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 14:58

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:

Who is this who says this?

Rev 1:11 Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

we all agree this would be Jesus right?

and who is this?

Isa 44:6 Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.

also this verse

Isa 48:12 Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last.

its good to read all these three chapters in their entirety. But you have to be pretty "unwilling" not to see it.

hmmhmm I would agree

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 15:01

Krispy-if that was what you thought-all you had to do was simply ask me was that my motive or plan-to swerve or bait you into such a topic. However I would not post a Thread about Calvin, then purposefully switch or try to TRICK someone.

But I would also, if I am correct, I was one of the first people to agree with you pertaining to Bible translations-if I recall

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 15:40

Quote:

-----Denying the trinity = heresy

I wholeheartily deny the trinity.

There is no such wording in the bible where it says, "God the Father, God the Son, and God the holy Spirit". And I am using the KJV I might add.

It does say, "God the Father of our LORD Jesus Christ", and also "Son of man", and "Son of God. Jesus even said, "I am", but the wording "God the Son" is not there.

But no where does it say, "God the holy Spirit".

It does say, 1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Nowhere does it say in the KJV that there are 3 "PERSONS" in the Godhead.

However it does say that, Hebrews 1:3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

I am NOT Oneness, nor Trinitarian, to me it's not a salvation issue.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/18 15:54

During the period leading up to the Revival Conference several non-trinitarians started posting on SermonIndex, since then I've seen the forum content and quality take a dive. I'm not saying that there is a link, but I believe that this false doctrine is detracting from the forum's stated goal of fostering revival teaching in this generation.

Every major heresy and false religion in the past 1900 years has been associated with denying the full deity of Jesus Christ. As Krispy already pointed out, the most major schism between Mormonism, JW and Islam and traditional Christianity is the deity of Jesus.

If you are a Oneness Pentecostal, or a Unitarian, you are closer theologically to the Muslims than you are to the Baptists.

If Jesus is not God, He cannot forgive sin, and if He cannot forgive sin, we all stand condemned.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 15:59

Quote:

Compliments wrote:

Quote:

-----Denying the trinity = heresy

I wholeheartily deny the trinity.

There is no such wording in the bible where it says, "God the Father, God the Son, and God the holy Spirit". And I am using the KJV I might add.

It does say, "God the Father of our LORD Jesus Christ", and also "Son of man", and "Son of God. Jesus even said, "I am", but the wording "God the Son" is not there.

But no where does it say, "God the holy Spirit".

It does say, 1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Nowhere does it say in the KJV that there are 3 "PERSONS" in the Godhead.

However it does say that, Hebrews 1:3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

I am NOT Oneness, nor Trinitarian, to me it's not a salvation issue.

Compliments, I can agree with all that you have said.

To me, rather even of greater importance-to Jesus Christ, it is a matter of salvation:

John 8:24 I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.

John 17:3 And this IS life eternal, that they might KNOW thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent

I might add, I am not oneness, I am not trinitarian...I am a Christian who believes wholeheartedly in 1 John 5:7 and that of Jesus Christ

Re: - posted by LoveHim, on: 2007/12/18 16:00

Quote:

-----I wholeheartedly deny the trinity.

There is no such wording in the bible where it says, "God the Father, God the Son, and God the holy Spirit". And I am using the KJV I might add.

It does say, "God the Father of our LORD Jesus Christ", and also "Son of man", and "Son of God. Jesus even said, "I am", but the wording "God the Son" is not there.

But no where does it say, "God the holy Spirit".

It does say, 1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Nowhere does it say in the KJV that there are 3 "PERSONS" in the Godhead.

However it does say that, Hebrews 1:3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

I am NOT Oneness, nor Trinitarian, to me it's not a salvation issue.

brother, do you think we should open up a new thread and talk about this. i would like to ask you some questions about your post, but this thread was supposed to be for calvin and that stuff with him.

anyways, i regard you as a brother and that is how i would like any posts we may have with each other to be saturated with the love of God.

ps, i could pm you if you would like that better.
just let me know.

phil

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 16:15

Deut 6:4-5 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is **one LORD**: And thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

If you do not believe in the Trinity, but you believe that Jesus is God (or more accurately "a" God) then you are a polytheist... meaning you believe in multiple gods.

This is one reason why most Jews reject Christianity because in their minds they see us as worshipping 3 gods. The Holy Scriptures declare... there is only **one** true God. Period. Yet Jesus made it clear that He was God, and even called Himself "I AM".

No, this is a heresy that is being promoted. Compliments, you know the love and friendship I have for you, but on this one we have to disagree because I think you are seriously wrong here. I'm sorry to say that, and it greives me, but it's true.

Krispy

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/18 16:16

Quote:

-----But no where does it say, "God the holy Spirit".

Act 5:3 But Peter said, Ananias, **why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost**, and to keep back part of the price of the land?

Act 5:4 Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? **thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.**

What do you make of this?

Peter had no problem giving equal footing to the Spirit and to God. The Bible also refers to the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ. If it is His Spirit, then how can it not be God? Unless you wish to deny the deity of Christ, and that is another problem altogether.

Christ also said that He would send Another like Himself, so again is Jesus God? Then One like Himself would be God too.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/18 16:31

Quote:

KrispyKrittr wrote:

Deut 6:4-5 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is **one LORD**: And thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

If you do not believe in the Trinity, but you believe that Jesus is God (or more accurately "a" God) then you are a polytheist... meaning you believe in multiple gods.

This is one reason why most Jews reject Christianity because in their minds they see us as worshipping 3 gods. The Holy Scriptures declare... there is only **one** true God. Period. Yet Jesus made it clear that He was God, and even called Himself "I AM".

No, this is a heresy that is being promoted. Compliments, you know the love and friendship I have for you, but on this one we have to disagree because I think you are seriously wrong here. I'm sorry to say that, and it greives me, but it's true.

Krispy

Krispy, Jesus Christ is the God of Deut 6:4-5.

I never said I believe Jesus to be "A" God, I said I do believe him to be God-the Great I AM.

Jews, if I am not mistaken also totally reject the "trinity" teaching/doctrine because they have always known God to be ONE-the Holy ONE of Israel

However, the first century Church, in which the first members were Jews themselves, believed and knew that JESUS was the God of the Old Testament that taught and walked with them for 3 years.

In my writing, I was simply stating the Holy Scripture speaks of the "Godhead"-never the "trinity"-

Acts 17:29 Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and **MAN'S DEVICE**.

Romans 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Col 2:9 For **IN HIM** (Christ) dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

I might add, it says all the fullness of the Godhead bodily **DWELLS IN CHRIST**

Not Christ the second in the trinity, or God the Son second in the trinity-but rather the Godhead dwelling bodily **IN CHRIST**

The Word says " Now the Lord **IS THAT SPIRIT..**"
2 Cor 3:17

The Lord in this verse, is Jesus Christ-and it says that he (Jesus) " **IS THAT SPIRIT**"-well what Spirit is that- the Holy Ghost.

Again, my sole belief is 1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three **ARE ONE**.

John 1:1 ".....and the Word was God

Re:, on: 2007/12/18 16:51

It's amazing to me that you quote this...

1 John 5:7 *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*

... and then you deny it. There are three distinct persons here. The Father, The Word (Jesus) and the Holy Ghost. It could not any more clear here... there are three distinct persons.

I wonder if you're confused using "Godhead". Could this be a matter of semantics? What am I missing here? Maybe the word Trinity means something to you that it doesn't to me.

I often refer to the Trinity as the "Godhead". Who doesn't?

There can only be one God. Yet there are three persons. They, according to scripture, are One. And they are equal. (Phil 2:6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be **equal with God**..."

I call that the Trinity.

I believe God is ONE God... revealed in three distinct and separate persons. Do I understand how He does it, or why He does it... or the ins and outs of it? Hardly. But this is where JW's and Mormons miss it. Because they can't understand it or explain it, they simply dismiss it.

I think Christians do the same thing. If they come across a doctrine that they can't wrap their feeble little minds around... they toss it out and call it heresy.

Krispy

Re: - posted by LoveHim, on: 2007/12/18 17:13

Quote:
-----1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.... and then you deny it. There are three distinct persons here. The Father, The Word (Jesus) and the Holy Ghost. It couldn't any more clear here... there are three distinct persons.

that's what i'm trying to figure out. 1 john 5:7 declare that there are 3 persons and they are 1. all i know is that these 3 statements are true regarding the Godhead

- 1) there is one God.
- 2) the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three distinct persons, but not separated. (hence not 3 gods)
- 3) each are called God in scripture.

to eliminate any one of these three statements, in my opinion, is to plunge into error concerning the Godhead.

i hope this may help someone out. just my 2 cents.

phil

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/12/18 17:21

Benny Hinn says they are actually nine..... 3 x 3

sorry i could not help myself :-P

the starting of a new thread or looking into some old one would be good, the original topic seems lost

Re: heresy - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/18 22:31

Hi everyone.

I would like to share some things with you all.

Have posted this before and think it is worth repeating,

Strong's defines the greek word translated heresies in Galatians chapter 5 this way:

G139

αἵρεσις

hairesis

hah'ee-res-is

From G138; properly a choice, that is, (specifically) a party or (abstractly) disunion. (Â“heresyÂ” is the Greek word itself.): - heresy , sect.

a choice

Maybe we could fill this out more by saying: *a choice* which leads to disunity.

I have this in my own mind as something (but perhaps not only this) a person contends for which is not clear or otherwise unmistakably set forth in scripture, which they contend for to the disunity of believers. At every point along the way the choice is made to press the issue, even perhaps forcing then others to take sides.

I have a sense of this also as a self-willed contending for of our own, personal, revelations, ideas, or interpretations of scripture. This is why I think it is called a work of the flesh.

All of this could be avoided if we would never open our mouths to begin with on some things. Or if, when we do, and others reject our ideas, we leave it at that.

Unless we have clear direction from God that we are to contend for the thing, why then do it?

Take for instance the word trinity. Men, at some point insisted on this word to define the Godhead. And now, even though no Apostolic writer ever used the word, men are called heretics if they do not adopt it, or assent either to the defining of *persons in the godhead* though no Apostolic writer used the phrase either.

But God sees clearly.

Chris

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/18 22:56

May I add here, that if that definition of heresy is acceptable, then this work of the flesh is ubiquitous in our day?

Men, in very short lives, are willing to write and say and speak more volumes than even God has in the whole of the Bible over centuries and centuries. And willing, not to just present their ideas, but to state them with bold confidence. Even going beyond what God Himself has said. As though they see all things, or that thing, clearly, and absolutely.

Re: - posted by daniel- (), on: 2007/12/21 8:22

Hello,

I have heard someone that denied the deity of Jesus arguing that Christ is nowhere called God in the scriptures. That is not true.

In Hebrews 1 vers 8 and 9 - this is talking about Jesus - we read:

8 But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Here, The Son (Jesus) is called God AND there is a distinction made between Jesus and the Father in vers 9.

Daniel

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/21 11:51

I would just like to add, personally one of my favorite verses of Scripture in the Holy Word-pertaining to Jesus BEING the Father, or let me also say it like this: Jesus being IN THE FATHER, but the FATHER ALSO BEING IN THE SON.

John 14:6 Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. 7 If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth YE KNOW HIM, AND HAVE SEEN HIM. 8 Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. 9 Jesus saith unto him, **Have I been so long time with you**, and yet hast thou not KNOWN ME, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou the n, Shew us the Father? 10 Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that DWELLETH IN ME, he doeth the works. 11 Believe me that I am in the Father, AND THE FATHER IN ME: or else believe me for the very works' sake.

Jesus initial reply was : Have **I** been so long with you and yet thou hast NOT KNOW ME-when Philip asked TO SEE **THE FATHER**

One thing I think people often don't pay to much attention to is the fact that the Father is IN JESUS as well as Jesus IN the Father.

Even in Revelation, it is John who testifies:

Rev 4:2 And immediately I was in the spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and **ONE** sat on the throne.

Heb 1:8 But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

Now this "ONE" on the the throne is definiely JESUS-but this brings into Light something so clear-if JESUS is the "ONE" on the throne, how is he also " seated at right hand of God"-and how come John nowhere ever in Revelation says he sees someone " seated at the hand of God"- He sees the throne itself and the "ONE" seated on it-but never says he sees s

Someone seated next to the "ONE" on the throne at his right hand.

This is even because Jesus is in the Father, and the Father in him-so even when scripture says " he is seated at the right hand of God" we must understand that the Father is STILL IN HIM even while seated at his right hand-because " I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE" not one in union only, but ONE in totality, ONE in being.

And that the ONLY time they have ever been separate was when Jesus became sin and was forsaken of the Father.

1 John 5:7 For there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these are one .

Why does it make reference to the " Word" and not the Son specifically-though, Jesus is the Word, and John 1:1 says ".. and the Word was God"

Is not the Father & the Word-God

1 John 5:7 And there are 3 that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word.....-are not both the Father & the Word the same exact literal person?

The Father is God

The Word is God; & the Word is JESUS; that was made Flesh, which was the Father-because the Father is God that the Word became in Flesh-JESUS CHRIST

JESUS Christ, the Great " I AM"-God manifested in the flesh

Re:, on: 2007/12/21 16:08

Quote:
-----Compliments, you know the love and friendship I have for you, but on this one we have to disagree because I think you are seriously wrong here. I'm sorry to say that, and it grieves me, but it's true.

Dear LORD Krispy, don't be grieved. Jesus Christ is not only my LORD but He's my God, not 'a' god. I know of whom I have believed.

General Topics :: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/21 16:59

Although he would confess his lack of understanding of the tri-unity, trinity, Jonathan Edwards view of the Godhead is exhilarating:

"The Godhead being thus begotten by God's loving an idea of Himself and shewing forth in a distinct subsistence or person in that idea, there proceeds a most pure act, and an infinitely holy and sacred energy arises between the Father and Son in mutually loving and delighting in each other, for their love and joy is mutual, (Prov. 8:30) "I was daily His delight rejoicing always before Him." This is the eternal and most perfect and essential act of the Divine nature, wherein the Godhead acts to an infinite degree and in the most perfect manner possible. The Deity becomes all act, the Divine essence itself flows out and is as it were breathed forth in love and joy. So that the Godhead therein stands forth in yet another manner of subsistence, and there proceeds the third Person in the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, viz., the Deity in act, for there is no other act but the act of the will."

Both the monist and the modalist are in error. Both are heretical in light of orthodox teaching whether Calvinist or Arminian. The trinity is a mystery, and fallen men hate mystery. We want all the answers. If what Christian scholars have investigated and taught through the ages leaves a mystery open, there are always those who will wish to shut the door on that mystery. Such it is with the liberal renouncing of the virgin birth. Such it is with the doctrine of the Trinity.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/22 0:38

Hi again all,

I think what davyman shared is illustrative of this: that even though men admit the mystery of God's Divine nature and being, they are willing to spend great efforts and pour out many words trying to explain it.

Who asked us to do that? God?

The Apostolic writers, whose writings are accepted as God breathed, they wrote very little. But men who make no claims to such inspiration write volumes.

Re: - posted by intrcssr83 (), on: 2007/12/22 4:46

Php 2:12 Therefore, my dear friends, as you have always obeyed--not only in my presence, but now much more in my absence--continue to work out your salvation with fear and trembling,
Php 2:13 for it is God who works in you to will and to act according to his good purpose.

Re: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him? - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/12/22 7:47

Original question:

Who was the man that John Calvin killed for not agreeing with him and why? Thanks for any information or links posted-

This question has been answered but has quickly evolved into a doctrinal discussion concerning the trinity.

Now my question to you all is, does denying the doctrine of the Trinity justify any one in having that person killed? This is what John Calvin was instrumental in doing...

ginnyrose

Re:, on: 2007/12/22 10:27

Quote:
-----Now my question to you all is, does denying the doctrine of the Trinity justify any one in having that person killed? This is what John Calvin was instrumental in doing...

John Calvin was KING of Geneva, also known as the Protestant Pope, made himself GOD in deciding who lived and who died.

One interesting thing about the reformation was the FREEDOM of religion, however Calvin missed the point completely, and was as guilty as the Catholic Church for playing God.

Violent religions kill in the name of their god, however We do not.

That is really the bottom line. Calvin was a heretic just on that principle alone.

But, as we see religion in politics, beware of those who would mandate your righteousness apart from your very personal relationship with the Lord....going on witch hunts as the Puritan Calvinists did when they came over here. Much has come out since then, and much of that was to control land, much of which belonged to women whose fathers or husbands died. Or just plain disputes having to do with control.

Jesus said, My Kingdom is not of this world....and Calvin having missed the mark of True Christianity all the way around, thought the fruit he was to bear was grown out of the dirt of the earth....Cain. ...Rather than the Fruit of the Spirit....that never kills under any circumstances.

This spirit is the spirit of anti-christ, as many believe the stronghold of the Pope has over the Catholic Church.

We (Christians) believe in the individual Priesthood of the Believer, and our High Priest is Jesus Christ Himself.

Pastors are to be examples to the flock....not lord it over the flock.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did :-)

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/22 10:44

Quote:

ginnyrose wrote:

Original question:

Who was the man that John Calvin killed for not agreeing with him and why? Thanks for any information or links posted-

This question has been answered but has quickly evolved into a doctrinal discussion concerning the trinity.

Now my question to you all is, does denying the doctrine of the Trinity justify any one in having that person killed? This is what John Calvin was instrumental in doing...

ginnyrose

The question has been answered but somewhat wrongly. Calvin did not have Servetus killed. His role was to present evidence of Servetus' heresy. Calvin did so so well that the libertines and patriots on the Genevese Council found Servetus guilty (along with letters of charges from 4 other cities). Calvin pleaded with Servetus to recant, but Servetus felt his chances were better in Geneva than Lyons, which had requested extradition. The council found Servetus guilty and ordered his execution by burning. Calvin asked that Servetus be put to death more humanely, by beheading. The council refused.

This is a great link concerning the Servetus trial:
http://www.ccel.org/s/schaff/history/8_ch16.htm.

General Topics :: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/22 11:01

Quote:

Katy-did wrote:

Quote:
-----Now my question to you all is, does denying the doctrine of the Trinity justify any one in having that person killed? This is what John Calvin was instrumental in doing...

John Calvin was KING of Geneva, also known as the Protestant Pope, made himself GOD in deciding who lived and who died.

One interesting thing about the reformation was the FREEDOM of religion, however Calvin missed the point completely, and was as guilty as the Catholic Church for playing God.

Violent religions kill in the name of their god, however We do not.

That is really the bottom line. Calvin was a heretic just on that principle alone.

But, as we see religion in politics, beware of those who would mandate your righteousness apart from your very personal relationship with the Lord....going on witch hunts as the Puritan Calvinists did when they came over here. Much has come out since then, and much of that was to control land, much of which belonged to women whose fathers or husbands died. Or just plain disputes having to do with control.

Jesus said, My Kingdom is not of this world....and Calvin having missed the mark of True Christianity all the way around, thought the fruit he was to bear was grown out of the dirt of the earth....cain. ...Rather than the Fruit of the Spirit....that never kills under any circumstances.

This spirit is the spirit of anti-christ, as many believe the stronghold of the Pope has over the Catholic Church.

We (Christians) believe in the individual Priesthood of the Believer, and our High Priest is Jesus Christ Himself.

Pastors are to be examples to the flock....not lord it over the flock.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did :-)

As I posted earlier, Calvin was not involved in the civil affairs of Geneva. He did not exercise his will over the council, in fact the council was hostile toward him in many things. He did not have Servetus killed, he presented strong evidence of Servetus' heresy; among his many false teachings was his denial of the triune nature of God. Calvin's own power as pastor of the church in Geneva was restricted to excommunication, (by the way, I feel would have been the proper response to Servetus) which could be overturned by the council.

Calvin tolerated Lutherans, Anabaptists (which he thought were heretics), and even Catholics. He was not opposed to free religion. He felt Servetus was a "murderer of souls," and deserving of his punishment. I disagree with the death sentence for heresy, but I don't live in 1534.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/12/22 13:46

davyman wrote:

Quote:
-----Calvin asked that Servetus be put to death more humanely, by beheading. The council refused.

So Calvin did not actually **kill** Servetus but he sure did not work to prevent it. Not a whole lot of difference, do you think? I do not see the mind of Jesus operating in this man....do you? Can you imagine **any** of the apostles acting like this?

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/22 13:50

Yes I can: "And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" Luke 9:54.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/12/22 14:07

Quote:
-----Yes I can: "And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" Luke 9:54.

Yes, and what did Jesus say? Mind quoting Jesus response?

ginnyrose

Re:, on: 2007/12/22 14:10

Calvinism is not just about whether one believes in the trinity, but Calvinism itself, Predestination Election, that God picked out only certain people to save, limiting His atonement, denying John 3:16.....and this was Calvin's legacy. Calvin learned much from Augustine, who was a KNOWN Gnostic.

So, Servetus is only a small incident. Please don't let Servetus distract from the real Calvin and the real issues.

I've always wondered, If Calvin only believed certain people were chosen, why on earth did he force this doctrine on everyone, even the
???unelected???? What a contradiction of bunk.

So then, if you are not one of Calvin's elect seeing it exactly as Calvin saw it, you were a heretic, and run out of the city.

Believe me, whether he was KING or not, he sure acted like he was.

This again is NOT Christianity. Since when do Christians form a group of *thugs* to control anything, people, places or whatever.

Again, Pastors are told by Paul to be examples to the flock, and not lord it over anyone.

We have a conscience...each one of us...to worship God in a personal intimate relationship.

Calvinism is RELIGION pure and simple. Christianity is NOT religion but relationship.

Calvin's Controversies

Within the city itself Calvin's struggles were with a party called Patriots. They were the descendants of the original citizens of the city, dyed-in-the-wool Roman Catholics when Calvin came, and much given to riotous living. As refugees streamed into Geneva from all over Europe to escape persecution, the Patriots resented the fact that the control of the city was passing into foreign hands. They hated Calvin and did all in their power to destroy him. When the church was able finally to excommunicate the leaders for their licentiousness and the Council approved, these men fled.

But Calvin's theological controversies were the most important. Calvin wrote against the papacy to show its evils and demonstrate how far it had departed from the doctrines of Christ. He had to fight to defend the truths of the trinity and the divinity of Christ against many who attacked these doctrines, not the least of whom was Servetus, burned at the stake in Geneva for blasphemy.

But especially his controversies swirled around his defense of the truths of sovereign and particular grace in the work of salvation. And, as is usually the case, the most vicious attacks are concentrated against the doctrine of sovereign predestination. Many hated this doctrine and sought to destroy it. Perhaps the most interesting controversy over this doctrine was with the heretic Bolsec. Bolsec interrupted the preaching of one of Geneva's pastors to get up in the middle of the sermon and make a speech against the truth of predestination. What Bolsec did not know was that Calvin had entered the sanctuary and was listening to Bolsec's tirade. After Bolsec finished, Calvin mounted the pulpit and, in a masterful sermon, extemporaneous but an hour long, explained the doctrine and proved it from Scripture.

But Bolsec was not deterred and continued to fight against this truth publicly in Geneva. He was arrested for his opposition to the church and Council and was tried for heresy and public defamation of the ministers. The advice of the other Swiss reformers and churches was sought before Bolsec was condemned. To Calvin's bitter disappointment, not one church or reformer, with the exception of Farel, could be found to back Calvin's position completely and without compromise. Their caution or disagreement was concerning Calvin's doctrine of predestination.

Nevertheless, Calvin persevered and Bolsec was condemned and banished from the city. From the controversy emerged one of Calvin's most important works, "A Treatise on the Eternal Predestination of God," a work which, along with another work on Providence, has been published in the book, "Calvin's Calvinism"

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/22 14:22

Ginny,

You originally asked "Can you imagine any of the apostles acting this way?" They acted exactly this way. Jesus rebuked them, I don't dispute that in any way. But the zeal that had heretics burned at the stake in the 1500's was the same zeal the apostles felt.

Again, I don't offer an argument for the actions of 16th century Christians; burning was a horrid act. Calvin approved of Servetus' execution, he was wrong. But the error of historical revisionism needs to be put right. Calvin was not the "Pope of Geneva." He abhorred the Pope's power. He could have had magisterial as well as pastoral power but he refused it.

I hope you don't think I'm picking a fight. I respect every opinion within the pale of orthodoxy. I am reformed in my own theology and find much good in the writings of Calvin, Luther Knox and the puritans. However, I respect Arminians like CS Lewis and Wesley.

In His love,

Dave

Re:, on: 2007/12/22 14:38

Daniel said:

Quote:

-----Here, The Son (Jesus) is called God AND there is a distinction made between Jesus and the Father in vers 9.

I said the "wording" doesn't say "God the Son". Does the word say, "God the Son"? To me the wording is very important. It's like reading a legal document, if the wording isn't right, there is no agreement.

Do you understand what I was trying to put forth?

General Topics :: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?

Re:, on: 2007/12/22 14:54

lovehim said:

Quote:
-----brother, do you think we should open up a new thread and talk about this. i would like to ask you some questions about your post, but this thread was supposed to be for calvin and that stuff with him

I agree, but it seemed to have swerved at the beginning of the thread into the Godhead. Further down I saw Krispy's comment and I joined in. I thought the thread was about the Godhead, though the title was a bit confusing. However, I did go back to the original thought and I guess I was too late and just kept the Godhead thought going it seemed to be more interesting. But you are right, this should be in another discussion. I am kind of in and out on sharing my understanding of the Godhead. How I see it (and I do hope that I am seeing it right) is a much deeper understanding of the Godhead than traditional ideas. And I do understand that when someone introduces new data into what has been normal for ages becomes a shock and hard to receive. Remember what Elijah said to the woman who was going to have a child she said, "Don't lie to me man of God", it shocked her. She's well pass her time of childbearing and then she hears this news. I might still go ahead with your request. Thanks for pointing that out.

Re:, on: 2007/12/22 14:56

Here is a little history about the Calvinist Puritans still wanting to control and mandate Religion.

What would we do if anyone here wanted to pass a law Banning Christmas? It seems as though there are for maybe different reasons here, just wanting to do away with the Christian faith all together.

The celebration of Christmas has always been complex. So much so that in days of old the church actually attempted to have Christmas banned. It was in England during the time of Oliver Cromwell. His Puritan Party passed legislation outlawing Christmas. In England there would be no more lavish and raucous celebration, no more commercial exploitation, there would be no more Christmas, period. Viewed by the Puritans as superfluous, not to mention threatening, to core Christian beliefs, all activities to do with Christmas, both domestic and religious, including attending church, were forbidden.

But the people were outraged. There was rioting in the streets. Secret Christmas celebrations broke out all over England. Parliament decreed penalties of imprisonment for anyone caught celebrating the holiday. Town criers went through the streets a few days before Christmas, reminding people that "Christmas and all other superstitious festivals" should not be observed, businesses should remain open. There were to be no displays of Christmas decorations.

The Puritans although surprised by the strength of popular resistance to their anti-Christmas policies would not alter them or compromise their principles. They simply went down to defeat in the next elections. The Puritans were thrown out of power - and Christmas was back. Except in cold New England, the zeal of the Puritans persisted long after it had faded away in England. The holiday that we know as Christmas remained outlawed in Massachusetts until the second half of the nineteenth century. Anyone caught celebrating would pay a fine of five shillings to the county.

Re:, on: 2007/12/22 15:40

Quote:
-----You originally asked "Can you imagine any of the apostles acting this way?" They acted exactly this way. Jesus rebuked them, I don't dispute that in any way. But the zeal that had heretics burned at the stake in the 1500's was the same zeal the apostles felt.

Dave, can you quote verses referring to the Apostles acting this way? Must have been before they were filled with the Holy Spirit.

Now some of the Jews did believe Jesus was coming to set up His Kingdom, and overthrow Rome, and that will yet come to pass.

That will be in Jesus time, when He returns, His second Coming. However, Calvinism or reformed Theology falling into the trap of Dominionism, to win the world for Jesus Christ before He returns is anti-Christ to the core.

Paul and the Apostles after Pentecost never went around to take over cities and Countries trying to conform them to Christianity. The mistake has been the Catholic Church believed it to be this way...and look what a mess that is. Look at the Crusades, the Inquisition etc. This is not of God. Calvin never could rid himself of that mentality. We see this through history and the behavior of the Puritans.

Do you know the whole story of South Africa? Who and what was the driving force behind that mess?

Read "The Light and the Glory by Peter Marshall.

Puritan Calvinists believed themselves to be God's New chosen People, and America or anywhere they set foot in, God's New Promise Land, ***Literally Killing*** those they believed to be the ITES in the Land.

And to think they had such control over the state of Massachutes that anyone celebrating Christmas would be FINED is unheard of by Christian standards. Any *Big Brother* religious organization with that BIG SEEING EYE looking down at you is a cult.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/22 15:57

You know kathy, it's a wonder the Church has continued on without your wondrous critique of perhaps one of God's more gifted saints. How did they ever get on without your warning of heresy?

It is funny because you condemn Calvin for murder, but then go about "murdering" him here with your words.

What you are saying is nothing more than pure arrogance, and ignorance of Historical facts. Perhaps if you would take time to read some Historical writings about Geneva at the time, you would see that it was Calvin who begged for the Council to spare Servetus, or at least have a less severe death. It is because of their hatred towards Calvin that they killed Servetus in the manner in which they did.

To call Calvin a Protestant Pope is nothing more than to parrot words that have been spoke over and over again by those who cannot disprove the doctrine, have not read Calvin, and generally speak out of hatred for the man.

Go read the Institutes of Christian Living(both volumes) and then come back and tell us how ungodly Calvin was. Read his commentaries, and his masterful exegesis of the original languages(Hebrew, Latin, and Greek) of the documents, and manuscripts he had.

Better yet, read his writings on piety, and you will find a man whose heart yearned for the things of Christ.

I am not writing this to simply defend Calvin, but rather to expose the faulty knee jerk reaction to things we do not understand. "Love is patient..."

It is this attitude and hatred of all things orthodox that has kept me away for some time. Good to see things have not changed.

Merry Christmas, and blessed advent.

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/22 16:23

Katy,

I only quoted that verse to show that the apostles were capable of wrongly condemning just as Calvin was. I don't have any argument with you. Are we capable of wrong actions whether we are filled with the Holy Spirit or not? Certainly. We continue to submit to our sinful nature, however we are redeemed. Let me reiterate, Calvin and the council of Geneva were wrong in burning Servetus. I only wanted to set the record straight that Calvin neither burned nor commanded the burning of Servetus. He is culpable because he approved of it.

The apostles were fallible men. They didn't walk around with halos on their heads. Peter was rebuked by Paul for his error on circumcision, for example. Paul expressed his own bitterness about John-Mark and parted company with Barnabas over it.

What is astounding is that God used these men to give us His infallible Word.

The verse I originally quoted was Luke 9:54 "And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?"

Again, it is not my intention to say that the apostles were guilty of burning men at the stake. But burning a village was in their hearts. Jesus rightly castigated them "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of" (v.55). Their zeal was not for the things of God, rather it was pride of their own position.

Instead of arguing whether they were filled with the Spirit at this time, I prefer to look into my own heart and ask whether my zeal is for the Lord or for my own theological position. Am I glorifying God or am I justifying my own position to look good?

As for the Puritans, there are no finer writing in all of Protestantism than those of John Owen, John Bunyan, Richard Baxter, and William Bridge, to name a few. They were not the dour legalists that they are made out to be.

The stand they took on Christmas is understandable. It was one of those pendulum swings that occur to correct the error that was prevalent in their day. I have considered something that Whitefield wrote about our coming home from receiving the Lord's table and then partaking in frivolous activities. It makes me think when I get home from church as quickly as I can to turn on the football game. What did the communion service really mean to me? How did it change my life for even an hour?

So, I'm not going to pick up a stone to throw at Calvin. He was wrong, but had you or I been in his position living at his time, what would we have done. It is only by God's grace that I don't have to answer that one at judgment day.

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/22 16:25

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

You know katy, it's a wonder the Church has continued on without your wondrous critique of perhaps one of God's more gifted saints. How did they ever get on without your warning of heresy?

It is funny because you condemn Calvin for murder, but then go about "murdering" him here with your words.

What you are saying is nothing more than pure arrogance, and ignorance of Historical facts. Perhaps if you would take time to read some Historical writings about Geneva at the time, you would see that it was Calvin who begged for the Council to spare Servetus, or at least have a less severe death. It is because of their hatred towards Calvin that they killed Servetus in the manner in which they did.

To call Calvin a Protestant Pope is nothing more than to parrot words that have been spoke over and over again by those who cannot disprove the doctrine, have not read Calvin, and generally speak out of hatred for the man.

Go read the Institutes of Christian Living(both volumes) and then come back and tell us how ungodly Calvin was. Read his commentaries, and his masterful exegesis of the original languages(Hebrew, Latin, and Greek) of the documents, and manuscripts he had.

Better yet, read his writings on piety, and you will find a man whose heart yearned for the things of Christ.

I am not writing this to simply defend Calvin, but rather to expose the faulty knee jerk reaction to things we do not understand. "Love is patient..."

It is this attitude and hatred of all things orthodox that has kept me away for some time. Good to see things have not changed.

Merry Christmas, and blessed advent.

Amen.

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/22 16:34

Quote:

Katy-did wrote:

Calvinism is not just about whether one believes in the trinity, but Calvinism itself, Predestination Election, that God picked out only certain people to save, limiting His atonement, denying John 3:16.....and this was Calvin's legacy.

From Calvin's Commentary:

16. For God so loved the world. Christ opens up the first cause, and, as it were, the source of our salvation, and he does so, that no doubt may remain; for our minds cannot find calm repose, until we arrive at the unmerited love of God. As the whole matter of our salvation must not be sought any where else than in Christ, so we must see whence Christ came to us, and why he was offered to be our Savior. Both points are distinctly stated to us: namely, that faith in Christ brings life to all, and that Christ brought life, because the Heavenly Father loves the human race, and wishes that they should not perish. And this order ought to be carefully observed; for such is the wicked ambition which belongs to our nature, that when the question relates to the origin of our salvation, we quickly form diabolical imaginations about our own merits. Accordingly, we imagine that God is reconciled to us, because he has reckoned us worthy that he should look upon us. But Scripture everywhere extols his pure and unmingled mercy, which sets aside all merits.

And the words of Christ mean nothing else, when he declares the cause to be in the love of God. For if we wish to ascend higher, the Spirit shuts the door by the mouth of Paul, when he informs us that this love was founded on the purpose of his will, (Ephesians 1:5.) And, indeed, it is very evident that Christ spoke in this manner, in order to draw away men from the contemplation of themselves to look at the mercy of God alone. Nor does he say that God was moved to deliver us, because he perceived in us something that was worthy of so excellent a blessing, but ascribes the glory of our deliverance entirely to his love. And this is still more clear from what follows; for he adds, that God gave his Son to men, that they may not perish. Hence it follows that, until Christ bestow his aid in rescuing the lost, all are destined to eternal destruction. This is also demonstrated by Paul from a consideration of the time;

for he loved us while we were still enemies by sin,
(Romans 5:8, 10.)

And, indeed, where sin reigns, we shall find nothing but the wrath of God, which draws death along with it. It is mercy, therefore, that reconciles us to God, that he may likewise restore us to life.

This mode of expression, however, may appear to be at variance with many passages of Scripture, which lay in Christ the first foundation of the love of God to us, and show that out of him we are hated by God. But we ought to remember — what I have already stated — that the secret love with which the Heavenly Father loved us in himself is higher than all other causes; but that the grace which he wishes to be made known to us, and by which we are excited to the hope of salvation, commences with the reconciliation which was procured through Christ. For since he necessarily hates sin, how shall we believe that we are loved by him, until atonement has been made for those sins on account of which he is justly offended at us? Thus, the love of Christ must intervene for the purpose of reconciling God to us, before we have any experience of his fatherly kindness. But as we are first informed that God, because he loved us, gave his Son to die for us, so it is immediately added, that it is Christ alone on whom, strictly speaking, faith ought to look.

He gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him may not perish. This, he says, is the proper look of faith, to be fixed on Christ, in whom it beholds the breast of God filled with love: this is a firm and enduring support, to rely on

in the death of Christ as the only pledge of that love. The word only-begotten is emphatic, (ἐμφατικὸν) to magnify the fervor of the love of God towards us. For as men are not easily convinced that God loves them, in order to remove all doubt, he has expressly stated that we are so very dear to God that, on our account, he did not even spare his only-begotten Son. Since, therefore, God has most abundantly testified his love towards us, whoever is not satisfied with this testimony, and still remains in doubt, offers a high insult to Christ, as if he had been an ordinary man given up at random to death. But we ought rather to consider that, in proportion to the estimation in which God holds his only-begotten Son, so much the more precious did our salvation appear to him, for the ransom of which he chose that his only-begotten Son should die. To this name Christ has a right, because he is by nature the only Son of God; and he communicates this honor to us by adoption, when we are engrafted into his body.

That whosoever believeth on him may not perish. It is a remarkable commendation of faith, that it frees us from everlasting destruction. For he intended expressly to state that, though we appear to have been born to death, undoubted deliverance is offered to us by the faith of Christ; and, therefore, that we ought not to fear death, which otherwise hangs over us. And he has employed the universal term whosoever, both to invite all indiscriminately to partake of life, and to cut off every excuse from unbelievers. Such is also the import of the term World, which he formerly used; for though nothing will be found in the world that is worthy of the favor of God, yet he shows himself to be reconciled to the whole world, when he invites all men without exception to the faith of Christ, which is nothing else than an entrance into life.

Let us remember, on the other hand, that while life is promised universally to all who believe in Christ, still faith is not common to all. For Christ is made known and held out to the view of all, but the elect alone are they whose eyes God opens, that they may seek him by faith. Here, too, is displayed a wonderful effect of faith; for by it we receive Christ such as he is given to us by the Father — that is, as having freed us from the condemnation of eternal death, and made us heirs of eternal life, because, by the sacrifice of his death, he has atoned for our sins, that nothing may prevent God from acknowledging us as his sons. Since, therefore, faith embraces Christ, with the efficacy of his death and the fruit of his resurrection, we need not wonder if by it we obtain likewise the life of Christ.

Still it is not yet very evident why and how faith bestows life upon us. Is it because Christ renews us by his Spirit, that the righteousness of God may live and be vigorous in us; or is it because, having been cleansed by his blood, we are accounted righteous before God by a free pardon? It is indeed certain, that these two things are always joined together; but as the certainty of salvation is the subject now in hand, we ought chiefly to hold by this reason, that we live, because God loves us freely by not imputing to us our sins. For this reason sacrifice is expressly mentioned, by which, together with sin, the curse and death are destroyed. I have already explained the object of these two clauses,

which is, to inform us that in Christ we regain the possession of life, of which we are destitute in ourselves; for in this wretched condition of mankind, redemption, in the order of time, goes before salvation.

SDG,

Dave

Re:, on: 2007/12/22 18:29

Dave and Roaringlamb,

I appreciate your comments, and know there are many who believe Calvinism to be a cult.

I thought the following data might interest you as well.

You know Puritan Calvinists settled in Massachusetts. What many people may not know is the following...and the connection between that big Seeing Eye seen in many Calvinist Churches (also Mormons) as well as connected to Masons.

Isn't it interesting all these Extremely important people listed below are mainly from Massachusetts.

Those who have done their homework know more than the average person who would never make the connection.

There are numerous articles documented by Christian sites who would not be called arrogant for telling the truth.

1733 - In the United States, the first Masonic circles began to appear in 1733; by the time of the American Revolution, in

early 150 lodges existed throughout the colonies.

1761 - James Otis, born in Mass. Known for his famous challenge to the British -imposed writs of assistance- general search warrants designed to enforce more strictly the trade and navigation laws in North America. At this time he also reportedly coined the euphonious, oft-quoted phrase, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." He was chosen as speaker of the house in 1766. Confirmed Mason.

1764 - Samuel Adams, born in Boston. A major propagandist, opposing British officials and policies, as well as British taxation in the colonies. In 1773 he participated in the planning of the Boston Tea Party. Adams also signed the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Served as delegate to the Continental Congress until 1781, and became governor of Massachusetts from 1794-97. Confirmed Mason and Illuminist.

Other Parts of the World England. 1765-1795 Edmund Burke, born Dublin Ireland. Entered the House of Commons in 1765. As a member of Parliament he became known as a Political thinker and important in the history of political theory. Confirmed Mason.

1773 It's just like Freemasonry. The lower Freemasons have no idea that the High Shriner Freemasons are working for the Jesuit General. They think that they're just doing works and being good people. But the bottom line is that the high-level Freemasons are subject, also, to the Jesuit General because the Jesuit General, with Frederick the Great, wrote the High Degrees, the last 8 Degrees, of the Scottish Rite Freemasonry when Frederick protected them when they were suppressed by the Pope in 1773. So, you have the alignment with the Jesuit Order and the most powerful Freemason they had in the craft, Frederick the Great, during their suppression. That is an irrefutable conclusion. And then, when you see the Napoleonic Wars, the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars carried out by Freemasonry, everything Napoleon did, and the Jacobins, whatever they did, completely benefited the Jesuit Order. The Black Pope

1775 - Joseph Warren, born Roxbury, Mass. Soldier and leader in the American Revolution who sent Paul Revere and William Dawes to Lexington and Concord on their famous ride to warn local patriots that British troops were being sent against them. Helped draft a group of protests to Parliament known as the "Suffolk Resolves." Confirmed Mason. In December 1769 Warren, received commission for the Earl of Dalhousie, Grand Master of Masons in Scotland, appointing him Provincial Grand Master of Masons in Boston and within 100 miles of the same. The commission was dated May 30, 1769. When the Earl of Dumfries succeeded Dalhousie as Grand Master of Scotland he issued another appointment to Warren, dated March 7, 1772, constituting Warren "Grand Master of Masons for the Continent of America," thus extending his original limits.

1775 - Paul Revere, born in Boston. Hero of the American Revolution whose dramatic horseback ride on the night of April 18, warning Boston-area residents that the British were coming. Confirmed Mason. GRAND MASTER GRAND LODGE OF MASSACHUSETTS A.F. & A.M. 1795 - 1797

1776 - John Hancock, born in Mass. Wrote and the first to sign the Declaration of Independence, and served nine terms as the Governor of Mass. Confirmed Mason.

1776 - Benjamin Franklin, born in Boston. Was one of the diplomats chosen to negotiate peace with Great Britain, and who helped draft the Declaration of Independence, one of the 56 who signed this document, and was instrumental in achieving the adoption of the U.S. Constitution. Was also a Mason. Franklin was the Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania and published the first Masonic book in America. Was also a member of Sir Francis Dashwood's Hell Fire Club, along with the Collins family of Satanists. Both Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were members of this purely Satanic group who practiced satanic sexual occult rituals.

Also, isn't it strange as well that the Bushes belong to a secret society called Skull and Cross whatever...just a family tradition....hummmmm!

Interesting things professing Christians get involved in wouldn't you say?!!!

And those who call attention to this are ...arrogant???? Hardly!

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/22 20:34

Quote:
-----You know Puritan Calvinists settled in Massachutes. What many people may not know is the following...and the connection between that big Seeing Eye seen in many Calvinist Churches (also Mormons) as well as connected to Masons.

Now before you go comparing Calvinists to Mormons, please consider who Joseph Smith copied when speaking of his "conversion". It was none other than Charles G. Finney. It is also well documented that the area in New York in which Finney spent most of his time came to be known as the "burned over" district because people were burnt out from religion, because they could not do or be good enough, so they gave up.

From this area came two key groups which we know of today as the Jehovah's Witnesses, and the Mormons.

The Calvinists were the one ones warning people of Finney and his departure from Historical Christian doctrine, and his blatant heresy regarding justification and original sin.

Have there been some weird people who took upon themselves the name Calvinist? Sure, just as there are weirdos who say they belong to any other group religious or secular. Only one who wants to pre-judge, or one who has an agenda looks at the fringe people as representing the whole, and then speaks from lack of knowledge, ending up looking foolish rather than having any credibility.

So, please stop broad brushing all who are of the Reformed or Calvinist faith, because we believe in Christ, and share His blessings as you do, and even worse, you are defaming your own family.

Those who use the name of Christian to further their political agendas should rarely be taken as serious regarding their doctrine as one of them must be compromised.

Calvin fought diligently for a separation of Church and State as the Government of Geneva could at that time determine who was allowed communion, and who was not. Calvin saw this as the sole business of the Church, and worked diligently to make it happen.

I should also like to say that if Calvin had not in Geneva, there is a good possibility that the English Bible may have been seriously delayed in its appearance as men like Calvin, and John Knox worked to translate the Bible into English, and also comment upon the text to help lay people learn what was being said in the text. This was of course the Geneva Bible, which if you read the notes definitely lashes out at a Monarchical rule of the Church, and thus King James banned it, and has his own translation done.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/12/22 21:03

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:
-----You know Puritan Calvinists settled in Massachutes. What many people may not know is the following...and the connection between that big Seeing Eye seen in many Calvinist Churches (also Mormons) as well as connected to Masons.

Now before you go comparing Calvinists to Mormons, please consider who Joseph Smith copied when speaking of his "conversion". It was none other than Charles G. Finney. It is also well documented that the area in New York in which Finney spent most of his time came to be known as the "burned over" district because people were burnt out from religion, because they could not do or be good enough, so they gave up.

From this area came two key groups which we know of today as the Jehovah's Witnesses, and the Mormons.

The Calvinists were the one ones warning people of Finney and his departure from Historical Christian doctrine, and his blatant heresy regarding justification and original sin.

Roaringlamb.

Would you mind, whether in this thread or a PM, share with me this information that you speak of regarding Charles Finney? I am just curious as this is not the first time I have heard such things pertaining to him and his ministry

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/22 22:14

Brother I can give you this link, and Lord willing I will get you more info later.

(<http://history.sandiego.edu/GEN/civilwar/01/burned.html>) Burned Over District

Here is a very good article on Finney-

(<http://www.issuesetc.org/resource/journals/horton.htm>) Charles Finney

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/23 10:30

Here's a quote from this article: " Thus, in Finney's theology, God is not sovereign, man is not a sinner by nature, the atonement is not a true payment for sin, justification by imputation is insulting to reason and morality, the new birth is simply the effect of successful techniques, and revival is a natural result of clever campaigns. In his fresh introduction to the bicentennial edition of Finney's Systematic Theology, Harry Conn commends Finney's pragmatism: 'Many servants of our Lord should be diligently searching for a gospel that 'works', and I am happy to state they can find it in this volume.'"

What more can be said of a man that denies the basic tenets of the Christian faith?

Please also consider this fine article by my friend Bob DeWaay: cicministry.org/commentary/issue53.htm

As to the "seeing eye" I have been in Presbyterian, Lutheran, Reformed Baptist and Reformed churches. I have never seen this symbol anywhere except on an upside-down dollar bill in the offering plate. As far as Masons go, I have read sermon upon sermon by great Calvinists such as Spurgeon who opposed "the lodge."

Re:, on: 2007/12/26 14:03

I think so often we forget it is not an argument between two different camps, Calvinists and Armenians.....there are many, like myself who believe in Eternal Security OSAS, and am neither of these groups.

Reformed anything is reformed Catholicism. Well, what about those who were never Catholic to begin with....do we need to be reformed? NO!

Massachusetts was completely Politically controlled by the Puritans. If you didn't practice their faith in MA you were run out of the state.

It wasn't until the mid 19th century that Christmas, banned by the Puritans in MA was overturned.

The fact is, many of these Puritan rooted people in our country were Masons.....pure and simple.

Many Calvinists are Masons, this is a fact.

Here where I live several Baptist Churches are also Mason Temples and they share the same building. Many church Graveyards will also have things on the tombstones stating they were Masons.

Mormons are BIG Mason's as well.

Joseph Smith came from a Puritan background and got many of His ideas from not only Calvinism, but Mason ritual. (The select chosen few...pre-existing before the foundation of the world is all Mormon, yet many Calvinists believe they pre-existed before the foundation of the world)

God KNEW who would be saved, but we didn't pre-exist....that would almost be considered re-incarnation.

Christians for one do not take "secret oaths" under any circumstances.. It's absolutely forbidden in Scripture...

I'm not trying to be mean or ugly, but only asking you to really look into the ROOTS of many things here.

Bottom line is...all of this is Mystery Babylon, and God said, come out of her my People.

We worship God and God alone, not denominations, not people, not movements, not clans, Etc. Etc,

Just because one person like Finny was disapproved by another Group, doesn't mean the other group is correct either.

Example, If a Mormon disagreed with a JW, does that make a Mormon correct?

Love in Christ
Katy-Did ;-)

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/26 18:50

Katy,

You said "Reformed anything is reformed Catholicism. Well, what about those who were never Catholic to begin with...do we need to be reformed? NO!"

I don't know exactly how to answer this. The CHURCH needed reforming, it had lost the basic doctrines of grace. Thus the reformation. The reformers gave us Protestantism; I assume you are as I am, a protestant. Yet we do not protest anymore. My church, and I hope your church, practices the five tenets of the reformation.

1. Salvation is by Christ alone.
2. Through His grace alone.
3. By faith alone.
4. Based on the Scripture alone.
5. To God alone is the glory.

I did need reforming. I was hell-bounnd by my sin and Christ reformed me.

"Massachusetts was completely Politically controlled by the Puritans. If you didn't practice their faith in MA you were run out of the state." This and other information is posted as fact, yet I cannot find any reference to the puritans running anyone out of Mass. It may be, but I haven't read of it yet. Please share your sources.

"Many Calvinists are Masons, this is a fact." Again, show me your sources. I belong to a very large church that believes strongly the five points. My pastor and the whole of the elders are strongly against membership in any worldly lodge such as masonry. If such a member were to announce his membership to the church, he would be disciplined and probably removed from membership roles. I find writings like this:

"Freemasonry appealed to 18th century American Enlightenment thinkers for a number of reasons. First, the dwindling importance of Puritanism in the colonies paved the way for intellectualism over spiritualism. Deism, a religious philosophy often associated with early American Freemasons, views God as a scientist who created universal laws but who does not interfere in the daily lives of individuals. Founding Fathers Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Thomas Paine, and Ethan Allen are all thought to have had Deist beliefs. Freemasonry also supported the rational mind and the exchange of ideas, two cornerstones of the Enlightenment."

This article from secular educator, Susan Hyde, is typical.

"Joseph Smith came from a Puritan background and got many of His ideas from not only Calvinism, but Mason ritual."

From an LDS author "Joseph father, it appears, reacted against the strict discipline required by the contemporary religions of the day. . . He left the church and ended up not belonging to any church . . . there was a loosening of the strict bonds of contemporary Calvinism." I would say that he may have been influenced by masonry, but I haven't researched it.

I'm sorry but my research shows me that freemasonry is born out of enlightenment thinking, not reformation thinking. I should think that Calvin would have at least excommunicated Masons, probably worse.

I invite you to show me sources of your vitriol. I would humbly stand corrected.

SDG,

Dave

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/26 21:56

Hi everyone.

Katy-Did said

"Many Calvinists are Masons, this is a fact..."

What is the purpose of making this statement? To goad people into fighting with you?

Katy, when the Lord Jesus came into the house of Simon, what did he do to show his gratitude? Accuse the Lord Jesus in his heart of not being a prophet because a sinner was washing his feet.

Have you washed any feet since you've been here?

Christopher Joel Dandrow

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 9:39

How do we see these verses:

Quote:

-----John 6:44 No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him:

Quote:

-----Revelation 22:17 And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

Does Revelation 22:17 negate John 6:44?

Forget about Calvin and Arminism is and just consider the word.

Re: - posted by Lowly, on: 2007/12/27 10:07

Quote:

Compliments wrote:

Forget about Calvin and Arminism is and just consider the word.

"Just consider the word."

I believe everyone is trying to do just that. The Word has both of these concepts in it, and if you separate them that is where you fall on either side.

God has truly done it all, but man is accountable to respond.

Man must receive, enter in, diligently seek, allow, walk, follow, believe, put on, put off.....ect.

God has fully supplied, finished, promised, performed, it is freely given, granted, endowed, He has delivered, ransomed, won the victory.....all has been accomplished by Him.."I will" the Lord says.

He will finish the work that He has started, but I am actively participating in allowing Him to finish it.

What a glorious thing!

In His amazing love,
Lowly

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 11:04

What I have heard about John Calvin, he sounds to me like an extremist. He took a subject and ran with it without consulting the rest of the warnings that the bible gives. Now mind you, I've never read his writings, but the things that I have heard I must agree with. But we have many warnings such as:
Quote:
-----"He that endures to the end the same shall be saved". "If you, by the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body you shall live",

We can't just ignore these and wish them to mean something else. I think Calvin has some good points (from what I've heard) and Arminism has some good points. We shouldn't just derail Calvin for the sake of Arminism or vice versa, I think we should blend the two together and not be too extreme lest we too be unbalanced. And we know that a false balance is an abomination in the sight of God.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 13:00

Quote:
-----What I have heard

Yes, but I have heard that Jesus was not really who He claimed to be.

I have heard that the Bible contradicts itself.

I have heard that.....

The only way to speak with any authority on a subject is to study it. Do not just parrot phrases that you have heard, and then copy and paste them on here as a defense.

I will tell you that I had never read any of Calvin's writings prior to switching to what is nicknamed "Calvinism". I had read many lies about him though, and also many lies about Luther and Augustine.

Scripture is what drove me to surrender to God's sovereignty in all things, not man's words. But I have yet to find a point that does not agree with Scripture within Calvin's writings thus far.

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/28 23:20

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:

-----What I have heard

Yes, but I have heard that Jesus was not really who He claimed to be.

I have heard that the Bible contradicts itself.

I have heard that.....

The only way to speak with any authority on a subject is to study it. Do not just parrot phrases that you have heard, and then copy and paste them on here as a defense.

I will tell you that I had never read any of Calvin's writings prior to switching to what is nicknamed "Calvinism". I had read many lies about him though, and also many lies about Luther and Augustine.

Scripture is what drove me to surrender to God's sovereignty in all things, not man's words. But I have yet to find a point that does not agree with Scripture within Calvin's writings thus far.

Well put roaringlamb. I was reminded of Spurgeon's sermon "A Defense of Calvinism:"

Well can I remember the manner in which I learned the doctrines of grace in a single instant. Born, as all of us are by nature, an Arminian, I still believed the old things I had heard continually from the pulpit, and did not see the grace of God. When I was coming to Christ, I thought I was doing it all myself, and though I sought the Lord earnestly, I had no idea the Lord was seeking me. I do not think the young convert is at first aware of this. I can recall the very day and hour when first I received those truths in my own soul-when they were, as John Bunyan says, burnt into my heart as with a hot iron, and I can recollect how I felt that I had grown on a sudden from a babe into a man-that I had made progress in Scriptural knowledge, through having found, once for all, the clue to the truth of God. One week-night, when I was sitting in the house of God, I was not thinking much about the preacher's sermon, for I did not believe it. The thought struck me, How did you come to be a Christian? I sought the Lord. But how did you come to seek the Lord? The truth flashed across my mind in a moment- I should not have sought Him unless there had been some previous influence in my mind to make me seek Him. I prayed, thought I, but then I asked myself, How came I to pray? I was induced to pray by reading the Scriptures. How came I to read the Scriptures? I did read them, but what led me to do so? Then, in a moment, I saw that God was at the bottom of it all, and that He was the Author of my faith, and so the whole doctrine of grace opened up to me, and from that doctrine I have not departed to this day, and I desire to make this my constant confession, "I ascribe my change wholly to God."

SDG,

Dave

Re:, on: 2007/12/30 12:22

Dave wrote:

Quote:

-----I did need reforming. I was hell-bounnd by my sin and Christ reformed me.

Actually Dave, this is where we differ. Jesus didn't come to reform me, HE came to REDEEM me. Two totally different concepts.

General Topics :: Who was it that Calvin killed for not agreeing with him?

Many forget that there were Christians long before the Reformers of the 1500's. Huss, Wycliff for two came long....a couple hundred years in fact, before Calvin and Luther.

There have always been Born Again Christians who were NEVER Catholic to begin with, and needed no reforming.

Those Christians, were also murdered by the Catholic Church for not submitting to Catholicism. It wasn't just Jews who were murdered for not conforming.

The True Church, from the beginning of Pentacost have always been with us, as Revelation states clearly, that the gates of Hell will not prevail against the Church...the *Heavenly* Body of Christ. (Written long before the Catholic Church tried to take control). And that fact still stands today, regardless of what earthly group of Dominionists tries to take dominion over your minds and hearts.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re:, on: 2007/12/30 12:40

Quote:

-----Katy-Did said
"Many Calvinists are Masons, this is a fact..."

What is the purpose of making this statement? To goad people into fighting with you?

Katy, when the Lord Jesus came into the house of Simon, what did he do to show his gratitude? Accuse the Lord Jesus in his heart of not being a prophet because a sinner was washing his feet.

Have you washed any feet since you've been here?

Chris, have you ever wondered why the Reformed Churches in America preach the Gospel of America and not the Gospel of Salvation?

It never ends, how (James Kennedy for one) teaches all this about the Puritans coming to America and that America is God's New chosen People...that we're God's New Promise land" Read The Light and the Glory by Peter Marshall.

The fact is, all those who they profess were our founding fathers were either Masons or Deists Masons.....

When I hear what a wonderful Christian Thomas Jefferson was, I want to scream....he was not a Christian.

He actually wrote or should I say re-wrote the Bible, calling it the Jefferson Bible, taking OUT everything having to do with the virgin Birth, the deity of Christ and redemption through the Blood. It is/was a book of just plain moral living.

So, Reformed teachers want to re-write American History hoping to prey on the ignorance of Americans.

The fact is, our founding for-fathers were Masons, who the Reformed Churches exalt as Christians.

God never made a Covenant with a Gentile nation...ever.

When we hear...If My people who are called by my name will humble themselves. etc, etc, is used for America, how wrong is that.

That Promise was to Israel, a THEOCRACY, which we are not.

To put it another way. If you lived in China and were a Christian, humbling yourself, would God heal that land too, or Somalia, or anywhere else...NO!

Jesus said MY KINGDOM is not of the world.

No one is trying to cause a fight....but only trying to cause you to think....FACTS!

Love in Christ
Katy-did

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 12:54

Katy, you are relentless with accusations.

My question to you remains the same. Have you washed anyone's feet since you've been here?

Chris

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 12:56

Katy,

"No one is trying to cause a fight....but only trying to cause you to think....FACTS!"

I suppose Simon thought the accusations in his heart about the Lord Jesus were true.

Re:, on: 2007/12/30 14:07

ChrisJD, Do you understand the meaning behind washing feet?

Can you find a practice in any of the Epistles James, Paul or Peter wrote about Feet washing?

When we are washed in the Blood, we are Clean, yet in this world we get our feet dirty.

Peter said...Wash all of me, and Jesus said, that wasn't necessary.

If we confess our sin, He is faithful and Just to forgive our sin and to cleanse from all unrighteousness.

Do you know where this began?

Exodus 30:20-22

20When they go into the tabernacle of the congregation, they shall wash with water, that they die not; or when they come near to the altar to minister, to burn offering made by fire unto the LORD:

21So they shall wash their hands and their feet, that they die not: and it shall be a statute for ever to them, even to him and to his seed throughout their generations.

22Moreover the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

Yes, we are a Holy and Royal Priesthood unto God.

This signifies our own cleansing that only Christ Himself can do. Yet, when we do see others who are our brothers and sisters getting their feet dirty by the world, tip-toeing through Tulip Gardens God never planted to begin with, we do our best to warn those to wash their feet before it's too late.

Christ washes the disciples' feet.

By Matthew Henry:

Our Lord Jesus has a people in the world that are his own; he has purchased them, and paid dear for them, and he has set them apart for himself; they devote themselves to him as a peculiar people. Those whom Christ loves, he loves to the end. Nothing can separate a true believer from the love of Christ. We know not when our hour will come, therefore what we have to do in constant preparation for it, ought never to be undone. What way of access the devil has to men's hearts we cannot

tell. But some sins are so exceedingly sinful, and there is so little temptation to them from the world and the flesh, that it is plain they are directly from Satan. Jesus washed his disciples' feet, that he might teach us to think nothing below us, wherein we may promote God's glory, and the good of our brethren. We must address ourselves to duty, and must lay aside every thing that would hinder us in what we have to do. Christ washed his disciples' feet, that he might signify to them the

value of spiritual washing, and the cleansing of the soul from the pollutions of sin. Our Lord Jesus does many things of which even his own disciples do not for the present know the meaning, but they shall know afterward. We see in the end what was the kindness from events which seemed most cross. And it is not humility, but unbelief, to put away the offers of the gospel, as if too rich to be made to us, or too good news to be true. All those, and those only, who are spiritually washed by

Christ, have a part in Christ. All whom Christ owns and saves, he justifies and sanctifies. Peter more than submits; he begs to be washed by Christ. How earnest he is for the purifying grace of the Lord Jesus, and the full effect of it, even upon his hands and head! Those who truly desire to be sanctified, desire to be sanctified throughout, to have the whole man, with all its parts and powers, made pure. The true believer is thus washed when he receives Christ for his salvation. See then what

ought to be the daily care of those who through grace are in a justified state, and that is, to wash their feet; to cleanse themselves from daily guilt, and to watch against everything defiling. This should make us the more cautious. From yesterday's pardon, we should be strengthened against this day's temptation. And when hypocrites are discovered, it should be no surprise or cause of stumbling to us. Observe the lesson Christ here taught. Duties are mutual; we must both accept help from our

brethren, and afford help to our brethren. When we see our Master serving, we cannot but see how ill it becomes us to domineer. And the same love which led Christ to ransom and reconcile his disciples when enemies, still influences him. (John 13:18-30)

So Chris, please don't use scripture out of context to fight battles.

Thou shall love the Lord your God with all your mind, heart, soul....and have NO OTHER GODS before you! ;-)

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 14:23

Dear Katy-Did,

May God bless you in serving His people.

Chris